



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

80

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,737	01/11/2002	Anthony E. Martinez	RSW920010153US1	1564

7590 08/10/2005
Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,737

Applicant(s)

MARTINEZ ET AL.

Examiner

Kristina B. Honeycutt

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination filed on July 15, 2005.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-14 are pending in the case. Claim 6 is cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 13 and 14 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Malamud et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030142123) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on January 11, 2002 are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030142123; publication date July 31, 2002; filed January 16, 2003; continuation of application filed January 21, 1999) in view of Matsushita et al. (U.S. Patent 6049340; date of patent April 11, 2000; filed November 7, 1996).

Regarding independent claim 1, Malamud discloses a graphic previewer image comprising a virtual sensor portion and a content-previewing portion (p.3, para. 42, 44) since Malamud teaches a information pointers that display graphical and/or textual information about objects to which the cursor points.

Malamud further discloses means for rendering, within the content-previewing portion, a preview of the content, responsive to determining that the virtual sensor portion has been positioned over the representation of the content (p.3, para. 42, 44) since Malamud teaches rendering and displaying graphical and/or textual information about objects to which the cursor points.

Malamud further discloses means for enabling a user to position the virtual sensor portion of the graphic previewer image over a representation of content to be previewed (p.3, para. 42, 44) since Malamud teaches the cursor pointing to an object and the information associated with the object is displayed. Malamud does not disclose that the representation is partially viewable through, and within a visual crosshair of the virtual sensor portion. Matsushita teaches viewing a representation through and within

Art Unit: 2178

a crosshair (Figure 6; col. 7, lines 35-39, 55-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Matsushita before him at the time the invention was made, to modify viewing a representation as taught by Malamud to include viewing through a crosshair as taught by Matsushita, because viewing the representation through a crosshair, as taught by Matsushita (Figure 6; col. 7, lines 35-39, 55-61), would allow a user to ensure the correct portion of the image would be rendered since the user could see the representation through the crosshair.

Regarding independent claim 2, Malamud discloses rendering, within the content-previewing portion, a preview of the content to be previewed, responsive to detecting that the virtual sensor portion has been dragged over the representation (p.3, para. 44).

Malamud further discloses providing a previewer graphic for dragging over a representation of content to be previewed, the previewer graphic comprising a virtual sensor portion and a content-previewing portion (p.3, para. 42, 44) but does not disclose the representation is partially viewable through, and within a visual crosshair of the virtual sensor portion. Matsushita teaches viewing a representation through and within a crosshair (Figure 6; col. 7, lines 35-39, 55-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Matsushita before him at the time the invention was made, to modify viewing a representation as taught by Malamud to include viewing through a crosshair as taught by Matsushita, because viewing the representation through a crosshair, as taught by Matsushita (Figure 6; col.

Art Unit: 2178

7, lines 35-39, 55-61), would allow a user to ensure the correct portion of the image would be rendered since the user could see the representation through the crosshair.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Malamud discloses the previewer graphic replaces a cursor of a visual display of the computing system (p.3, para. 42).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Malamud discloses the rendered preview uses cached information associated with the content to be previewed (p.6, para. 70).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Malamud the representation is a file icon and the content to be previewed is a stored file (p.6, para. 68; Figure 2Q3).

Regarding independent claim 13, Malamud discloses means for detecting that the virtual sensor portion has been dragged over the representation (p.3, para. 44) since Malamud teaches a pictorial representation of the contents of the object being output when the tip of a cursor arrow obscures a portion of the object.

Malamud further discloses means for rendering, within the content-previewing portion, a preview of the content to be previewed, responsive to the means for detecting (p.3, para. 42, 44) since Malamud teaches a pictorial representation of the contents of the object being output when the tip of a cursor arrow obscures a portion of the object.

Malamud further discloses means for providing a previewer graphic for dragging over a representation of content to be previewed, the previewer graphic comprising a

Art Unit: 2178

virtual sensor portion and a content-previewing portion (p.3, para. 42, 44) since Malamud teaches a information pointers that display graphical and/or textual information about objects to which the cursor points. Malamud does not disclose the representation is partially viewable through, and within a visual crosshair of the virtual sensor portion. Matsushita teaches viewing a representation through and within a crosshair (Figure 6; col. 7, lines 35-39, 55-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Matsushita before him at the time the invention was made, to modify viewing a representation as taught by Malamud to include viewing through a crosshair as taught by Matsushita, because viewing the representation through a crosshair, as taught by Matsushita (Figure 6; col. 7, lines 35-39, 55-61), would allow a user to ensure the correct portion of the image would be rendered since the user could see the representation through the crosshair.

Regarding independent claim 14, the claim reflects a computer program product comprising computer-readable program code for performing the system of claim 13 and is rejected along the same rationale.

6. Claims 3, 5, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud in view of Matsushita in further view of Petropoulos et al. (U.S. Pub. No 20030146939; publication date August 7, 2003; filed September 24, 2001).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding dependent claim 3, Malamud does not disclose the representation is a hyperlink and the content to be previewed is a Web page. Petropoulos teaches a hyperlink as a representation and previewing a Web page (Figure 1; p.2, para. 23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing content as taught by Malamud to include previewing Web pages and hyperlinks as representations as taught by Petropoulos, because opening each Web page to determine if the contained material is relevant is unwieldy and time consuming, as taught by Petropoulos (p.1, para. 7,8), as is opening files and documents, as taught by Malamud. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because allowing the user to preview a Web page before opening the page would save time and efficiently utilize resources since irrelevant Web pages would not be opened and browsed.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Malamud does not disclose the rendered preview comprises a thumbnail version of the Web page. Petropoulos teaches a thumbnail version of the Web page as the rendered preview (Figure 1; p.1, para. 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing content as taught by Malamud to include previewing Web pages as thumbnails as taught by Petropoulos, because opening each Web page to determine if the contained material is relevant is unwieldy and time consuming, as taught by Petropoulos (p.1,

Art Unit: 2178

para. 7,8) as is opening files and documents, as taught by Malamud. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because allowing the user to preview a thumbnail version of the Web page before opening the page would save time and efficiently utilize resources since irrelevant Web pages would not be opened and browsed.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Malamud does not disclose navigating to the Web page, responsive to a user's request and displaying the Web page, responsive to the navigating. Petropoulos teaches navigating to the Web page responsive to a request and displaying the Web page (p.4, para. 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing content as taught by Malamud to include navigating to and displaying a Web page as taught by Petropoulos, because displaying the Web page would allow the user to view the entire Web page at full size per the user's request. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because allowing the user navigate to the Web page if he/she desired to would present the page at full size for browsing, printing, etc.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Malamud does not disclose the user's request is signaled by clicking within the previewer graphic. Petropoulos teaches requesting by clicking (p.4, para. 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2178

was made, to modify previewing content as taught by Malamud to include signaling a request by clicking as taught by Petropoulos, because displaying the Web page would allow the user to view the entire Web page at full size per the user's request and clicking to signal a request would allow users to easily access the page. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because allowing the user to navigate to the Web page if he/she desired would present the page at full size for browsing, printing, etc.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Malamud does not disclose the previewer graphic remains positioned over the displayed Web page. Petropoulos teaches the previewer graphic positioned over the displayed Web page (p.4, para. 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a previewer graphic as taught by Malamud to include the previewer graphic positioned over the displayed page as taught by Petropoulos, because positioning the previewer graphic over the displayed page would allow the user to view the preview alongside the associated information on the displayed page that caused the preview. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because viewing the preview with the displayed page would allow the user to compare the preview to the page in order to determine if further navigation to the full version of the page is necessary.

Art Unit: 2178

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud in view of Matsushita in further view of Krause (U.S. Patent 6160554; date of patent December 12, 2000; filed March 19, 1998).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Malamud discloses the content to be previewed is a stored file (p.6, para. 68).

Malamud does not disclose the representation is a file name. Krause teaches the file name as the representation (col. 1, lines 52-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Krause before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing a stored file as taught by Malamud to include the a file name as the representation as taught by Krause, because Krause teaches a representation as a file name or an icon (col. 1, lines 56-61) and Malamud teaches a representation as an icon (p.6, para. 68; Figure 2Q3) so a file could be represented as either a name or an icon. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because previewing stored files based on file names would allow the method to be used by more users with different storing preferences.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Loop menu navigation apparatus and method (U.S. Pub. No. 20030043206),
- System and method for previewing hyperlinks with 'flashback' images (U.S. Pub. No. 20020129114),
- Method and system for accessing information (U.S. Pub. No. 20010038395),
- System, method and article of manufacture for a visual self calculating order system over the world wide web (U.S. Pub. No. 20020042750), and
- Method for receiving and managing electronic files and file-managing device used therefor (U.S. Pub. No. 20010028363).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/044,737

Page 12

Art Unit: 2178

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER